

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

JOHN F. SAUNDERS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HOUSTON FOAM PLASTICS,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

SA-23-CV-00156-XR

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

To the Honorable United States District Judge Xavier Rodriguez:

This Report and Recommendation concerns the above-styled cause of action, which was referred to the undersigned for an order on Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and for a review of the pleadings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). The undersigned has authority to enter this recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). For the reasons set forth below, it is recommended that this case be dismissed for want of prosecution.

I. Background and Analysis

The record reflects that on February 23, 2023, the undersigned granted Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and ordered Plaintiff's proposed Complaint to be docketed. However, the undersigned ordered that service be withheld pending further review of Plaintiff's pleadings, as the form complaint filed by Plaintiff does not contain any narrative of the facts underlying his case, making it difficult to screen under Section 1915(e). The undersigned directed Plaintiff to file a more definite statement on or before March 16, 2023, and warned

Plaintiff that a failure to do so could result in dismissal for want of prosecution. To date, Plaintiff has not filed the ordered more definite statement.

A district court may dismiss an action for failure to prosecute or to comply with any order of the court. *McCullough v. Lynaugh*, 835 F.2d 1126, 1127 (5th Cir. 1988) (per curiam); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). In light of Plaintiff's failure to respond to the Court's Order to supplement his pleadings, the Court will recommend that Plaintiff's claims be dismissed for want of prosecution pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

II. Conclusion and Recommendation

Having considered the record in this case, the undersigned **recommends** that this case be **DISMISSED FOR WANT OF PROSECUTION**.

III. Instructions for Service and Notice of Right to Object/Appeal

The United States District Clerk shall serve a copy of this report and recommendation on all parties by either (1) electronic transmittal to all parties represented by attorneys registered as a "filing user" with the clerk of court, or (2) by mailing a copy to those not registered by certified mail, return receipt requested. Written objections to this report and recommendation must be filed **within fourteen (14) days** after being served with a copy of same, unless this time period is modified by the district court. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The party shall file the objections with the Clerk of Court and serve the objections on all other parties. A party filing objections must specifically identify those findings, conclusions or recommendations to which objections are being made and the basis for such objections; the district court need not consider frivolous, conclusive or general objections. A party's failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in this report shall bar the party from a *de novo* determination by the district court. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–52 (1985);

Acuña v. Brown & Root, Inc., 200 F.3d 335, 340 (5th Cir. 2000). Additionally, failure to file timely written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in this report and recommendation shall bar the aggrieved party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the un-objected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428–29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

SIGNED this 28th day of March, 2023.



ELIZABETH S. ("BETSY") CHESTNEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE